

COMBATING MODERN IDEOLOGIES FOR NATIONAL INTEGRATION

K.V. RAMAKRISHNA RAO

INTRODUCTION

In the context of National integration of India, what has to be combated is Modern ideologies formulated and circulated by theoreticians and ideologists, as they are generally conceived by few people intellectually, but misused and abused by many politically motivated anti-national and foreign forces with ulterior motives.

Persons of print and electronic media are prone to ideologies easily that control their thinking processes and through them they are propagated. Mainly, ideologies are applied to achieve certain specific objectives leading to psychological warfare comprising very often both verbal and physical terrorism masqueraded under progressive, secular, communist, leftist, forward thinking, broad-minded, modern, liberal — banners, claiming themselves to be crusaders against communal, obscurantist, medieval, rightist, fundamentalist, fanatic, fascist, radical — forces. Their spoken and written words are heavily dosaged with the expressions of human rights, women rights, children rights, minority rights, self-determination, right to work and so on.

To achieve their goal, they plant divisive thinking among the people with whom they interact and try to influence with their ideologies. Thus, in India, the oft-repeated

expressions are Indian sub continent, India—a nation in the making, India is a country comprising many nations, a Nation - State with many nationalities; linguistic nationalities, each such nationality can exercise their right of self-determination and so on. For this, they even make use of the Constitutional definition that "India, that is Bharat, shall be a Union of States" (Part I, Art.1), but forgetting that the "Union is a **federal union**, with a distribution of powers of which **the judiciary is the interpreter**" (AIR 1965 SC 745).

The industrialists, business giants, multinationals and others, whether they are capitalists or communists join the fray to push off their products among the divided people on the lines of ideologies according to their aggressive marketing methods to exploit the marketing potential of India. Financial companies including Insurance companies, too enjoy the situation getting their share. Thus, the nexus between Ideologies, industrialists and politicians has to be analysed along with such terms and expressions as they affect the life pattern of common people.

It is unfortunate to note that even International organisations aid and abet with the Super powers or dominating nations in the propagation of such ideas through their

official documents, journals and literature. They are also pointed out in the relevant context in this paper. Now, each such expression and argument is taken up for analysis to find out the truth in it.

IS INDIA A NATION?

The British rulers not only regarded India as a conglomeration of mainly hostile races, castes, tribes, nationalities and religious groups, but also claimed that only because of them they were living in a "state". Their official documents did not hide the fact. E.J. Rapson wrote in his *The Cambridge History of India*, "Indian empire is the abode of a vast collection of peoples who differ from one another in physical characteristics, in language and in culture more widely than the peoples of Europe".¹

This was elaborated by the Earl of Birkenhead, Frederick Edwin Smith, later Secretary for India from 1928, who said in 1925, "In the ultimate analysis the strength of the British position is that we are in India for the good of India. The most striking illustration of the truth of the position is supplied by the infinite variation of nationalities, sect, and religion in the sub-continent. The more it is made obvious that the antagonisms are profound, and affect immense and irreconcilable sections of the population, the more conspicuously is the fact illustrated that we, and we alone can play the part of composers".²

"In one way or another Indian nationalism owes so much to the British, who have provided almost all the factors uniting India, that is a matter of some

uncertainty whether a common national consciousness in India could survive the departure of the British".³

G.A. Grierson showed the many linguistic groups living in India in his, "Linguistic Survey of India". Herbert Risely discovered many races in his "People of India" (1908). J.A. Abbe Dubois differentiated as to how Indians were differing in his, "A Description of the characters, Manners and Customs of the People of India and of their Institutions — Religious and Civil". He could also find differences in the, "Hindu Manners, Customs & Ceremonies". Edgar Thruston found many, "Castes and Tribes of Southern India". William Turner could differentiate with cranial parameters in his, "Contributions to the Craniology of the People of the Empire of India" (1900). Max Muller invented "Aryans" and others "Dravidians" and Slater Gilbert could find "The Dravidian Element in Indian" or precisely in Aryan.

We could find how much of these ideas were freely used by Jinnah in claiming Pakistan, while corresponding with Gandhi and others, as he has used the very same language. Now, we could find the same tone and tenor in the expression of the separatist groups working under different banners with ideologies in India.

And, now we Indians happily have the same national problem, as we had hundred or so years back, and search for integration and factors in National integration! Let us analyse such arguments.

WAS INDIA NOT THERE AS A NATION?

If Indian nation was not there before the advent of the Britishers in India or on the earth itself, how it was known as "India"? Why the "Yavoneans" called the people of India as "Indians", though they did not call themselves as "Greeks"? Why the Columbus should try to find sea route to India instead of any other Nation? Even after reaching the so called "America", why he should have called it "India"? Could he find anything similar to India in "America" to call it so? Why the groups of Europeans — the Dutch, the Portuguese, the French, the British etc wanted to do "business" with "India"? Why there was "Indian ocean" even before the advent of such Europeans or when no other "Nation" was having one? Then, why is the defiance? Should Indians be judged or assessed with the Greek terminology or Greek political thought, as if India does not have one, in spite of its recognised past at par with China? Should India be certified as a nation by others, when they themselves were not existent on the earth or roaming in the jungles and painted themselves red, blue and black.?

INDIA A NATION IN MAKING OR BREAKING?

All English educated intellectuals very often write, speak and lecture jubilantly, "India is a Nation in the making". Even before Bryce, Ramsay Muir, R.N. Gilchrist, C.J.H. Hayes, who were struggling to juggle with the word "Nation" to define, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, H.J. Laski and others to discover the meaning of "State" and Aristotle to write about "State". India was a

Nation and State by all means. To suppress the fact only, such divisive ideas are planted in the minds of Indians leading to separatism. Therefore, they only try to break India, even after partition by referring to it as a Sub-continent.

IS INDIA A SUB-CONTINENT?

A continent is one of the main continuous bodies of land. Then, sub-continent must be a lesser "continent". But, all such lands are not recognised as "continents" e.g. United Kingdom, Arabian peninsula, Italy, Greece, Scandinavia and other land masses. Then, what is the reason or motive behind such mention made about India? Greeks, when they exchanged knowledge or Romans traded with India, Arabs took the knowledge of India to be spread in Europe and finally, the Europeans discovered route to India they never considered it as a "continent or sub-continent". Then, how it became sub-continent in 19th and 20th centuries? Has it acquired any extra land or territory to be qualified so? Or by the creation of Pakistan. It qualified as a "sub-continent"?

DIFFERENT NATIONALITIES

Of late, linguistic communities are equated with "nationalities". Can the mention of Indian Constitution of 18 nationalities under eighth schedule (Articles 344 (1) and 351) amounts to recognition of 18 nationalities in India? If we put all the definitions of nationality together, it is essentially spiritual in character, a sentiment, the will of people to live together with the same race/clan/stock/tribe/ethnicity culture/customs/mores, tradition/practice heritage/origin/legacy/ancestry language/literature/ religion/scripture/

history and common political associations, common ideals of political unity, thought and philosophy and so on. Which nation on the earth has such characteristics? Can we have such an ideal nation with citizens equal in respects just like a carbon copy or stereotype? No not a single nation! Then, why they use such verbiage in the Indian context? Next comes the multi-factorial argument to deny nationhood to India!

INDIA IS A LAND OF MULTI-FACTORS

India is a multi-lingual, multi-racial/ethnic, multi-religious, multi-cultural, multi-traditional, multi-heritage country. Therefore, it is multinational also, and hence, each such nationality can claim its nationhood. If we go by this rule, then each street, road, hamlet, village, town, city or metropolis becomes a "nation" by all means, because of its conglomeration, not only in India, but also in other countries or nations. So when this argument fails, it is said that India has a composite culture, a composite tradition and so on. What exactly is this "compositeness" i.e., mixture, blend or fusion? Can any analyst give the composition scientifically?

COMPOSITE FACTORS

Their is nothing single in India, every thing is many is the above argument. Another way of putting it in the context of culture is to say that India has a **composite culture**. However, it is not known as to why it is stopped with culture, but not extended to other factors as noted above! why composite tradition, composite heritage,

composite civilization, composite religion, composite language, composite race/ethnicity are not talked about? When cultures of Indians could be blended, mixed and fused together to have one composite culture, why not one composite tradition/heritage / civilization / race / ethnicity / language / religion and so on ? Will it block their minds, sabotage thinking and mar their ideology? Anyway, it is evident that only **culture** is targeted making it **composite**. Does it mean that more or less the **culture of Indians** is one?

NATIONALISM, COUNTER-NATIONALISM AND SUB-NATIONALISM

After "multi-nationalism", "sub-nationalism" is talked about to place "counter-nationalism" before "nationalism" to avoid the sin of "antinationalism". "Supra nationalism" is also justified for the fanatic religious groups who consider that their religion is above everything including the nation in which they live. If any citizen has a feeling of nationalism patriotically, then, where is the question of other "isms"? As all these wordy, verbose and garrulous arguments lead to divisive thinking and it is closely connected with another mischievous expression "Self-determination", it is discussed.

SELF-DETERMINATION

The idea of self-determination, as a political concept evolved at first as a by-

product of the doctrine of nationalism, to which an early expression was given by the French and American revolutionaries. This was accepted as a tool for peace by the Allies during the first World War (1914-18). The U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson also listed self-determination as an important objective for the postwar world in the Fourteen Point, but resulting in the fragmentation of the old Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires and Russia's former Baltic territories into a number of new States. The League of Nations also recognized the principle.

The expression Self-determination is nowadays being used in the context of Kashmir, north-east, Tamil and other insurgencies and exploited by all separatist forces according to their own interpretation to hide their secessionist motive. They trace their influence to Lenin.

In fact, V.I. Lenin sent his thesis. "**The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination**" to Norway to allow Swedish and Norwegian left wing socialists to study them in 1916.⁴ He himself recorded how his thesis was received by other Marxists with varied opinions and criticism. The question was raised in respect of Poland in 1895-96, before the London International Socialist Congress of 1896, by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Kautsky and the Polish independents who represented three different views.⁵

In the Indian context, having understood the implicative nature, the Communists cautiously opined that the repetition of the slogan that "**all nations or nationalities**" should be given the right of self-determination" would only amount to giving concession to destructive forces which represent narrow separatist views, they cannot be divided into **oppressive and oppressed categories**. Therefore, the inclusion of the proviso of self-determination would create a great danger helping separatist forces, instead of Indian working class fighting linguistic chauvinism, separatist forces, economic imbalance and state autonomy.⁶ In 1964, CPI(M) decided to remove the section relating to **self-determination**, but again in 1972, it was taken up.

In recent times, the very same Communist parties with their metamorphosis have not only started to preach the right to self-determination, but also the linked condition of the right to secede following in the footsteps of Lenin.⁷ This new ideology has so influenced the present separatist and anti-national forces that they have also started incorporating it in their propaganda with an aim to provoke the Indian "nationalities". Surprisingly, the literature of most of these organisations which have trans-territorial affiliations and loyalties and such foreign secessionist organisations convey the same language of Lenin.⁸

THE CONFUSION OF IDEOLOGIES

Lenin is very specific in this regard. He asserts that if we want to grasp the meaning of self-determination of nations, not by juggling with legal definitions or "inventing" abstract definitions but by examining the historic-economic conditions of the national movements, we must inviolably reach the conclusion that the self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies and the formation of an independent state. Again, in his theoretical essay, he mentions that the self-determination of nations in the Marxist programme, cannot from a historic-economic view, have any other meaning than **political self-determination, state independence and the formation of a national state.**⁹

Here, the Communists of Marx and Lenin divide in their opinion about the condition of "**secession**". Indian "nationalist" Communist oppose secession for obvious reasons, whereas, other extreme and revolutionary Communist categories strongly support it. They, thus argue that the right of nations to self-determination in Lenin's formulation means that the right of an oppressed nation to secede from the oppressor nation to form an independent national state. Therefore, those who pretend to recognize the right to self-determination, but argue that such right does not entitle the right to secede are neither Marxists nor Leninists, but Chauvinist parading under socialist slogans. According to them, they are pseudo-

socialists and are characterised by Lenin himself:

"A socialist in any of the oppressor nations who does not recognise and does not struggle for the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination (i.e., for the right to secession) is in reality a chauvinist, not a socialist."¹⁰

As they have prepared for such a condition to secede, ways are searched to claim that each linguistic, ethnic or cultural group constitute a separate "nation", thereby trying to fulfil the requirement. As each linguistic state has to become a "country" or "sub-continent" and not "nation". Therefore, the ideologues and theoreticians have started propounding that India is not a nation, but a country with many nations or nationalists, importing western and communist political thoughts and conflating them together.

Inspired by such ideology, each separatist group has started to exhibit and explain their exclusiveness by self-imposed characteristics. But, in such over enthusiastic approach, they have not considered and studied the national and international legal implications and complications to justify their stand within the framework of the Constitution of India, Indian Acts and Rules made thereunder.

DOUBLE GAME OF COMMUNISTS

Communists have been thus inconsistent with their own ideology. Thus by playing

with words, they would say anything and try to get away from their verbiage. They dub others thinking as "mere platitude", "a collection of errors in logic", "verbose article turning into a collection of empty and meaningless platitudes" and so on. But, they themselves exhibit such features and try to suppress or bury their contradictions, incongruities and hypocrisies to invent new arguments to white wash their double thinking, double talk and double game. The best example being the stand taken in the case of "Pakistan". First, the Communists accused the Muslim League leadership as a "**feudal-reactionary, exploiting the Muslims in the name of religion**", but all of a sudden, it started propagating the following theories¹¹ with the tinge of "Stalinism":

1. India is not one nation but a collection of several separate nationalities, many of them being **oppressed nationalities**¹².
2. The Muslims are not quite an oppressed nationalities but as they fear that the Hindus could suppress in the future and oppress them, **the demand for Pakistan is a just and democratic demand**¹³.
3. The Muslim League leadership has changed: "It is no longer feudal reactionary, no longer just a willing tool of imperialism. It is now an industrial bourgeois leadership, which is no more an adjunct of imperialism"¹⁴.

4. **The Muslim League itself is now progressive, it is referred to as the secular and anti-religious League and its growth is not the growth of communalism but the rise of anti-imperialist nationalist consciousness among the Muslim masses**¹⁵.

Surprisingly, the language used in all these "somersault" eulogy of Secular Muslim League is found faithfully in the writings of Stalin. He wrote in 1925:

"Nowadays India is spoken of as a single whole. Yet there can be hardly any doubt in the case of a revolutionary upheaval in India many hitherto unknown nationalities, each with its own language and its own distinctive culture will emerge on the scene".

As they continue to speak the same language even after partition and the collapse of U.S.S.R. the motive has to be known.

How the Communists and Capitalists, who have always been pitted against each other could have expressed the same language about India with unity? Were they *united to separate?*

"HUMAN RIGHTS AND SELF-DETERMINATION"

It is also argued that the twentieth century has been marked by awakening of many nations to independent development, because of the increase of national and

political movements to achieve self-reliance in the international context. The right of nations to self-determination, proclaimed by the French Revolution as an ideal, is today becoming a universally recognized principle of international law (Art. I of the U.N. Charter). This means not only the right of each nation to decide its own future, but also the state system which it considers most suitable for its development at a particular stage. This also implies the duty of all other states and nations to assist that nation in exercising its right to self-determination. However, that nation is not entitled to exercise its right to self-determination at the expense of the rights of another nation. A nation seeking self-determination can get the international support and recognition of its right only on conditions that it respects the rights of other nations to self-determination.

Today, the concept has been embodied in numerous international legal instruments including the U.N. Charter as has been already pointed out above. The U.N. Charter gives two specific meanings of the term self-determination (U.N. Charter: Article, paragraph. 2; Article 55, para.1). First, a state is said to have the right to self-determination in the sense of having right to choose freely its political, economic, social and cultural system. Second, the right to self-determination is defined as the right of

people to constitute itself in a state or otherwise freely determine the form of association with an existing state. Therefore, it is very evident that within a nation-state, self-determination is not entertained, as it blatantly violates the sovereignty, integrity and unity and that too particularly, when it is linked with the right to secede.

RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

The right to self-determination has been increasingly identified with the right to development, including the development of each individual. In the 1960s, development was interpreted as economic development and in the 1970s, it was regarded as a factor promoting observance of human rights and a necessary addition to social and cultural development. The right to development has already been embodied in a number of key international instruments, such as the U.N. charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants adopted by the United Nations.

NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (1974) states that such an order should be based on full observance of the principle of self-determination of all peoples, the right of each country to establish the economic and

social systems which it considers to be most suitable for its own development, without suffering any discrimination as a result of such a choice, and also full inalienable sovereignty of each state over its national resources and economic activity. Professor R. Rigaux of Belgium opines in his study undertaken for the UNESCO, that the right to self-determination is a foundation on which it would be possible to build a **new international economic order**¹⁶. Thus, the **New International Economic Order** is unwittingly connected with **self-determination**.

The study of Prof. Hector Gros Espiell of Uruguay (Hector Gros Espiell (Special Rapporteur, "Implementation of United Nations Resolutions Relation to the Right of Peoples under Colonial and Alien Domination to Self-determination", U.N. Document E/CN/Sub. 2-405, Vol.1; see also E/CN.4/SU B7 2/404) proposes that the legal recognition and effective implementation of right to full development of peoples struggling for self-determination - a right which, of course, is likewise enjoyed by states especially the developing states - can only be achieved given the recognition and implementation of the right of self-determination.

However, this concept does not cancel out or replace the existing system of rules and principles of modern international law, since the full realisation of the right to self-

determination can be most effective only if the other rules and principles of contemporary international laws are observed, including the principle of respect for national sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. As this is a human rights issue, it is obvious that under international law, **it is within the jurisdiction of each state and no international body is entitled to interfere in its domestic affairs**.

SEPARATIST MOVEMENTS

Many movements have been started with these ideologies under different banners as detailed below¹⁷. **Autonomist movements:** These are the most common to Communist of different taxonomic level: nation, nationality, tribe, ethnolinguistic and ethnoreligious groups. Being a legal and effective form of mass political mobilisation, they promote the ideology of **local nationalism** against the concept of "national integration". Starting with "Centre-state relations", they invariably embrace all aspects of sharing of powers on natural resources, decentralisation etc. The demand varies from **self-autonomy** to **full-autonomy**.

LINGUISTIC MOVEMENTS

Actually the aim at attaining socio-cultural autonomy when ethnic languages are acknowledged as official and used in the system of education, judiciary, mass media etc with political power, they slowly turn into

autonomist and separatist movements, bringing other geographical, historical and racial myths of exciting the masses.

ANTI-IMMIGRANT MOVEMENTS

They are known in various nations as movements of the sons of the soil (Bumiputra) against outsiders, foreigners and other titles. The aim is to deprive the migrants and their descendants of the privileged position, though earned by their hard work, restrict their political and civil rights or even oust them from identified chauvinist campaigns of the dominant ethnic, religious or linguistic groups against the dominating majority.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

These are most common to the states in which one of the religions or its branch is proclaimed a state religion or is supported by the state and they are controlled by fundamentalist, fanatic and terrorist forces leading to secession. Theocratic movements have not only trans-territorial loyalties, but also anti-national tendencies (supranationalism).

TRIBAL MOVEMENTS

These are aimed at preserving the traditional way of life and tribal particularism, encouraged by extraneous and trans-territorial forces. They are taught that all non-tribals are exploiting them enjoying their wealth and lands and therefore, such non-tribals should be driven

away so that a separate state can be formed exclusively for tribals. At many places, they are also converted into minority religious pockets to bring ethno-religious and linguistic dimensions directly leading to secession.

Besides, the above general categories, in India, there are specific movements which rely upon either one or more of the above reasons and combine local issues to pose new problems. Casteist, Dalit, Anti-Brahmin, neo-religious, anti-Hindi and minority movements, sometimes try to break national fabric, because of peculiar ideologies.

"NATIONAL" FACTORS

According to modern political context, each "nation" has historical and geographical myths about their traditional boundaries. The racial myths turned ethnic hypotheses are now explained by the ideologies and theoreticians of separatist movements to rouse the passion of people. Then they bring the "common coin of Language". Arnold Toynbee has rightly condemned those who seek "the criterion of Nationality in the shibboleth of Language".

Not only language was invoked by the European nationalism from 1848 to 1919, but also by the Indian chauvinists particularly after independence under various banners.

LANGUAGE AND NATION

Language can definitely not be an adequate criterion for nationality as it is not

a fixed datum and that politics shapes language as much as language shapes politics. In most parts of the world, linguistic communities are not of a size with all other "national" factors suitable for modern nation-states. The transition from empire to nation has often brought a complete reversal of attitudes towards linguistic diversity.

Only one distinct language may be predominant throughout the nation (e.g. Japan, Korea, Mongolia, Vietnam, Turkey and Madagascar) (a single language predominant in several neighboring nations the Spanish speaking nations of Latin America and the Arab nations of the Middle East and North Africa); a variety of closely related languages one of which serves as official language of which only one has substantial literary tradition (Morocco, Peru, Bolivia, Burma, Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador); a variety of distinct languages without literary tradition (Tropical Africa) and a variety of distinct languages each with its own literary tradition (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Cyprus)¹⁹.

RELIGION AND NATION

Religion is also considered for separate nationality, of course, where all other factors are also cleverly tagged, such as ethno-cultural and linguistic. But, in the present day world, we have so many nations, even though they have the same state religion or major religious group. Christian and Muslim

nations are examples for this case. While Christian nations fight with each other (crusades) calling the other of "anti-Christ" or "evil empire", Muslim nations do by branding their counterpart as "kafir" to wage jihad. The religious basis claim of nation/nationality is a proven myth in the case of division of partitioned Pakistan into two states.

Unity and diversity of language, culture, religion and culture and other socio-cultural factors are found out only among the people of the same category, but also **within themselves**. Therefore, such linguistic unity and diversity, cultural unity and diversity, religious unity and diversity or ethnic unity and diversity cannot be invoked for separate nationhood or nationality. Individual development is definitely having a bearing on the development of any nation, but at the same time, for individual's failures nation cannot be held responsible and thereby revolting against it. But, when national economic policies affect the development of individual and society as a whole, then he or she has every right to question the propriety of such policies and seek remedy.

DISSATISFACTION WITHIN A NATION

Discontent among the citizens should be carefully noted and understood to solve the problems upto their satisfaction. Coming to the main issue of national resources and their

distribution, all inherent practical difficulties should be taken into account. Socio-economic backwardness and the slow rate of development may be explained by objective factors like poor means of communication, long distances to major commercial and industrial centres, the scarcity of capital investment, inter-regional division of labour and so on. In some backward regions, the government very often cannot even cover the administrative costs with their own funds, and it has to subsidise them. In all such cases, the problem should be dealt accordingly with committed interest, but without bringing emotional factors, justifying or opposing such backwardness.

With the advancement of science and technology in the fields of transport, communication and industry, efforts can be made to overcome such natural and geographical obstacles to cater to and satisfy the needs of people of affected areas. **Modernity** has made man to come close together creating **interactive interdependency**. In such an interdependent state, no individual, group, society or even nation can act and live independently without depending on others. But, this does not mean that self-reliance should be sacrificed to create or have such perpetual dependency, particularly in the economic and scientific fields.

Nowadays, political scientists view modernity and nation together for the

progress of humanity achieving perfection. In the Indian context, modernisation can safely be taken as all socio-economic transformation processes widening control over nature and natural resources and their equal distribution through closer cooperation of Indians. As Indians form India, only through them modernity can be achieved. Scientific discovery, new technical skills, industrial production, professional and job-oriented education, quick transportation of goods and distribution of power to grass root levels are among the tools of modernity. In such modernisation process, Indianisation and Indigenisation and technology and skills are much necessary to achieve self-dependency.

In such a situation, Indians should try to solve their genuine socio-economic problems through national-political processes without exploiting ethno-linguistic and religio-cultural difference. When world nations are discussing about the right to self-determination for development of building a new economic order, it is a pity that our separatist ideologies talk about the right to self-determination in a different manner to divide India.

No doubt, India that is Bharat, is a union of states and the territories, but it never formed the entity of India with any right to secede. Federal system, in the modern political context, is definitely followed, but states cannot act independently against the

centre. If some groups of different ideology feel, in spite of the federal nature of Indian political system that they are not getting their share at par with other Indians, they can very well fight for their rights within the frame work of Indian Constitution. Regional economic imbalances can be removed, only through regional development processes, where the concerned people should have total commitment to achieve goals. Some such groups recently have gone to the extent of demanding to elect a new Constituent Assembly to enact new Constitution and incorporate the right of self-determination to all nationalities in such Constitution²⁰.

SEDITION

The word sedition is derived from the Latin sedition which means "going aside". All separatist tendencies and movements within a state, with all Western political and Indian legal context, are called seditious. Now, the word sedition has come to be applied to practices which tend to disturb internal public tranquility by deed, word or writing, but which do not amount to treason and are not accompanied by or conducive to open violence. The substance of the Indian law of sedition is contained in the Section 124A, 154A and 295A of Indian Penal Code. Section 2 of the Criminal Act, 1961 read with Sections 13(1) & (2) of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. There are other Acts relating to the specific offences like disrespect to national symbols

(Act 69 of 1971), national security (88 of 1980), anti-terrorism (61 of 1980) and Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act, 1985.

Invariably, the leaders of separatist movements and or ideology invite trouble by their deed, word or writing attracting the provisions of the above Acts. They do it, perhaps because of their over enthusiasm, purposeful motivation or wilful mischief. In any case, knowing the implications and legal implications, it is unbecoming on their part indulging in such activities.

The expression "self-determination" is not at all an ugly or sinful expression, when it is used in international development context. Indeed, Shri Aurobindo himself has written about self-determination almost at the same time, when it was uttered and discussed by westerners and communists including Lenin, but in his own way of mixing philosophy with polity:

"A new phrase has recently been cast out from the blood-stained yeast of war into the shifty language of politics, - that strange language full of Maya and falsities, of self-illusion and deliberate delusion of others, which almost immediately turns all true and vivid phrases into a jargon, so that men may fight in a cloud of words without any clear sense of the thing they are battling for, - it is the luminous description as the just power, the freely exercised right of **self-**

determination. The word is in itself a happy discovery, a thought-sign of real usefulness. For it helps to make definite and manageable what was apt till now to be splendidly vague and nebulous. Its invention is a sign at once of a growing clarity of conception about this great good which man has been striving to achieve for himself through the centuries, as yet without any satisfying success to boast of anywhere, and of their increasing subjectivity of our ideas about life"²¹.

Perhaps, we are familiar with the concept of India as a nation according to Shri Aurobindo. With that, one can understand how the beautiful expression "self-determination" is misused by the vested groups for their frustrated political ambitions deviating from the national unity and integrity. **No doubt every man has every right to determine about himself, but he cannot override or violate the similar right of other man.** This is applicable not only to individual, group, society, but to every nation in the world. That is how the world bodies like U.N., UNESCO and other forums have understood and propagated the idea for development of individuals and nations. Therefore, instead of linking self-determination with secession, it can be linked with self-fulfilment, self-improvement, self-reliance, self-righteousness, self-sacrifice

and ultimately self-development. If this is achieved, then, "self" from the above expressions can be removed in the national interest.

NATIONAL DIFFERENTIATION AND INTEGRATION

Nation is differentiated with the variables like language, culture, religion, race and other factors by some political and social scientists. Economists also do analysis of the financial, commercial and other processes involved in their methodology. At the same time, nation is also integrated almost with the same variables, which are used for national integration. Here, not only the concept of unity in diversity comes, but also the concept of "unity and diversity". In reality, we have unity and diversity in every variable like language, culture, ethnicity and other factors. Linguistic unity and diversity, cultural unity and diversity, religious unity and diversity and so on forming part of social processes. As in mathematical processes of differentiation and integration, we require constants to arrive at results, here also we should take these "unity and diversity" factors as constants in differentiation for national development and in integration for national sovereignty.

SECULARIZATION, MODERNISATION AND INDIANISATION

Secularization of Indian society would to some extent remove the divisive tendencies.

Modernization through industrialisation helps people to get their needy requirements. Modernization is thus not westernization in cultural context, but indigenisation of available technology. There, technical-know-how is imported, but not technology. Indianisation, like Americanization is only aimed at making every citizen "Indian". Feeling "Indian" does not take away any right of any citizen.

CONCLUSION

Modern political thought is soaked in incongruous hypotheses, inconsistent theories and impractical laws thus leading to formation of suffocating ideologies, fissiparous tendencies and separatist groups. In politics or political science or in any abstract subject, anything is defined in a round about way. Where there is ambiguity, scholars know that it can be interpreted in either way or any way. They can argue that such and such is not easy to define, for there is not one single factor to which it can be traced or it is easy to apprehend, but difficult to define. Therefore, with responsibility, scholars should work for the betterment and welfare of citizens of India. They should present the facts about India without giving distRACTive interpretations. By denying the facts of India, they can only create more problems in India. Let them be united in uniting the minds of the people of India.

NOTES AN REFERENCES

1. Vol.1, Cambridge, 1922, p.37.

2. **The Last Phase**, London, 1936, pp.245-246.
3. **Nationalism - a report by a group of Royal Institute of International Affairs**, Oxford, 1939.
4. **Collected Works**, Vol.22, Progress Publications, Moscow, 1964 pp.131-156 and 320-360.
5. **Ibid**, Vol. 20 - In another article, "The Right of Nations to Self-determination", he discusses the three views on independence.
6. **Indiyavil Desiya Inappachinai (Tamil) - Marxsiya anugumurai (A National problem in India - Marxist Approach)**, a CPI(M) publication.
7. **P. Maniyarasan, Indiyavil Desiya Inangal (Tamil) (Nationalities in India)**, Tanjore, Tamilnadu.
8. "Towards Liberation", LTTE Publication no.8, 1984. It contains selected political documents of LTTE and discusses "Self-determination" at length condemning Marxists and Leninists who support "self-determination", but refuse and oppose the linked

- condition of "the Right to Secede". Most of the separatist movements of "Tamilnadu" are not only deeply influenced by such an ideology, but have also started writing articles to attract the masses.
9. V.I. Lenin, opt.cit., Vol.20.
 10. V.I. Lenin, opt.cit.Vol.22.
 11. Arun Shourie, "The Only Fatherland - Communists, 'Quit India' and the Soviet Union", ASA Publications, New Delhi, 1991, p.100.
 12. "Work for the Congress-League Unity: Manifesto of the Communist Party of India for the India for the Unity Week", November 1-7, 1942 - a pamphlet.
 13. On Pakistan and National Unity, the resoiution passed at the Party's Congress in Bombay, May 1943.
 14. G. Adhikari (Ed), "Pakistan and National Unity", Peoples Publishing House, third revised edition, New Delhi, 1944.
 15. Communist Reply to the Congress Working Committee's Charges, PPH, Bombay, 1945.
 16. Document of UNESCO, 59-78 (conf. 630(s). p.25.
 17. "Present Day Asia : Ethnocultural and National Political Processes", Soviet Ethnographic Studies, Series, 9, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1989,pp.88-95.
 18. "A Study of History", Oxford University Press, 1934, London, Vol.8, p.536.
 19. Dankwart A.Rusow, A World of Nations - Problems of Political Modernisation", The Brooklings Institution, Washington D.C, 1967, pp.47-55.
 20. One of the resolutions passed by "Pattali Makkal Kazhagam" (PMK) conference held at Madras from 1-12, September 1992 in which the former PM V.P. Singh and others participated.
 21. Shri Aurobindo, "The Human Cycle, The Ideal of Human Unity, War and Self-determination", Shri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondicherry, 1962, p.834).